

some real pollutants out there. CO₂ is not a pollutant; it is a fertilizer. But there are real pollutants out there, SO_x, NO_x, and mercury. By working with our partners, the Asia-Pacific partners, we can expand our energy supply, increase trade, and along with these other goals, reduce greenhouse gases as a byproduct, along with reducing real pollutants such as SO_x, NO_x, and mercury. Others might put this list together differently in terms of priority, but my point is that the Asia-Pacific Partnership meets the criteria for success.

It is a politically and economically sustainable path forward that addresses multiple issues in the context of their relation to other issues. Perhaps other approaches in the future will meet this criteria as well, but this partnership is currently the only one that does.

Any international post-Kyoto agreement the United States enters into must make the concepts embodied in the APP a cornerstone of that agreement.

Let me conclude. I point out that climate alarmism has become a cottage industry in this country and many others. But a growing number of scientists and the general public are coming around to the idea that climate change is natural and that there is no reason for alarm. It is time to stop pretending the world around us is headed for certain doom and that Kyoto-style policies would save us—when, in fact, the biggest danger lies in these policies themselves. Again, new studies continue to pile up and debunk alarm and the very foundation for so-called solutions to warming.

I know this has been a long speech. I want the real people—not the money-driven liberals and the Hollywood elitists but the real people out there raising their families and working hard and paying taxes for all the stuff we are doing in Washington—we want to tell them that help is on its way and that all the U.N.- and media-driven hype to sell America down the river will fail.

During the past 2 hours, I have named hundreds of scientists who were Al Gore followers in the past and now who are skeptics; and they realize this issue is driven by money and the far left. The truth is coming out loudly and clearly.

As Winston Churchill said:

Truth is incontrovertible, ignorance can deride it, panic may resent it, malice may destroy it, but there it is.

Why am I willing to subject myself to the punishment by the alarmists and elitists? It is because of this. My wife and I have 20 kids and grandkids who are living in this world. I don't want them to have to pay a tax 10 times greater than they should because of something that is based on flawed science and contrived science. It is for them that we are doing it.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry. What is the Senate's current posture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I will speak for a couple of minutes. If somebody else comes to the floor and wants to be heard, I will yield at that time.

I think it is very important we realize something else is looming out there. As everyone knows, I am a conservative Republican. I have seen a thing called the Law of The Sea Treaty. It is coming at us again. This started back in the 1960s and 1970s. During the Reagan administration, President Reagan was able to stop it.

What this treaty would do, in one sentence, is this: It would relinquish our sovereignty to over 70 percent of the world—again, it is another United Nations initiative—to a superagency that will have the ability to tax globally.

During the last 2 years, I have talked about the problems we are having with the hyped global warming debate. It all came from the U.N. That is where a lot of these things come from. The U.N. is less and less accountable to any of the member countries than they were at one time.

One of the things we have done, and I have done personally, is every time we have had a problem where the U.N. is coming out with a policy not in the best interest of the United States, since the United States pays for 25 percent of the budget of the U.N., I have been able to pass a resolution that says that if the U.N. doesn't back down from this program, we will hold back 50 percent of our dues. It is the only leverage we have. Of course, they are outraged.

The people running the U.N. do not want to be accountable to anyone. The reason and the motivations of the Law of the Sea Treaty is to set up this superagency that does have taxing powers—global taxing powers. Their goal has been stated that if they are able to pass this, and they can run the U.N. on a global tax, then they don't have to be accountable to anyone. Here we are paying for 25 percent of it now. But we would not be at that time. It would be paid for independently.

I believe that of all of the bad things coming from this treaty, that is the worst. I think that is the motive of many of them. There are many other problems. By giving up the authority of over 70 percent of the Earth's surface, it has huge military risks. It puts

us into a position where if we in the United States know there is a ship on the high seas that has a terrorist aboard or has a weapon of mass destruction, we could no longer stop and search and try to seize it. It states there are only four conditions under which we could stop a ship, and none have to do with national security.

It does say it should not affect the military, but there is no defining term of military effort. Instead, that would be determined by this new high court that would be established—this high court that would be established by the U.N.

I know many people in this Chamber will say: Of course, it is coming from our Republican administration and the military says they want it. I question that when I go back and study what happened during the 1980s and see what the consequences could be. It is now a popular thing. We are saying we have made all the corrections and everything is satisfied now, and if President Reagan were here, he would sign off on it. That is not true. He had five objections to it. Not one of the five has been met.

So I suggest we have something very serious coming. I don't know why it is that the majority of Members of this body, the Senate, think that no idea is a good idea unless it is made by some big multinational organization, that nothing is good unless it is something that addresses a problem from a multinational perspective.

When I go back to Oklahoma, they ask me: What happened to sovereignty in America? I have to say I don't know, but we are going to try to keep it as much as possible. The best way to do that is to not ratify the treaty called the Law of the Sea Treaty. It is going to be a tremendous effort for us to get a number of Senators—34—to sign a letter saying we would oppose this treaty. It takes two-thirds to pass a treaty.

I think this is coming, and I want America to be ready for it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUDAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have repeatedly come to the floor to speak about one of the worst human tragedies in recent memory—the crisis in Darfur.

For 4 long years the world has watched this tragedy. We have witnessed the killing of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, the torching of entire villages, rape, torture, and untold human suffering.